

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The status of the claims is as follows:

Pending: 1-13

Rejected: 1-12

Newly added: 13

With regard to the rejections of claims 1-12 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, it is contended that the amendments to the claims and the amendment to the specification remove this rejection. Each term used in the claims now has proper antecedent basis. Furthermore, it is clear that the amendments to page 6 of the specification are well supported in the original disclosure and do not constitute new matter. In addition, newly presented claim 13 is also properly supported by the specification and drawings. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is requested.

The examiner has also rejected claims 1-12, all claims initially presented for examination, under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,860703, Courtois et al. (hereinafter "Courtois"). This rejection as it applies to the amended claims is respectfully traversed.

It is contended that the examiner is misreading the disclosure of Courtois. There is no disclosure in Courtois that the stalk 8 is prevented from being moved downwards permanently after the stalk 8 is moved above a certain position. In fact, the structure of Courtois cannot accomplish this result because there is no structure in Courtois that can or does prevent the stalk 8 from being moved downward permanently once a particular point has been passed. Claim 1 requires a stop device that allows one time movement of the stop device between an inactive position and an active position. Figure 4 shows the headrest being

placed into the seatback for the first time. During this movement, the slot 21 with an upwards facing stop face 23 on pin 6 engages the second stop branch 13. As illustrated in Figure 8, this pulls the entire stop device downwards so that the first stop branch 12 engages the slot 18. As pin 6 is raised to move the headrest to the low abutment position, the first stop branch 12 engages the slot 21.


Because the slot 21 has an upwards facing cam surface 22, the pin 6 can be pulled through the first stop branch 12. Figure 9 illustrates that the downward facing stop surface 23 prevents the pin 6 from being pushed downward to the retracted position as shown in Figure 8.

There is no structure of disclosure in Courtois has this claimed stop device that permanently prevents movement back to the inactive position. Because claims 2 to 13 are dependent on claim 1 they also are not anticipated by Courtois. This rejection is no longer warranted and should be withdrawn.

This application now appears to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action on all claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

McCracken & Frank LLP
200 W. Adams
Suite 2150
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 263-4700

By: 
J. William Frank III, Esq.
Reg. No: 25,626

October 7, 2004